

3628

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.					
TRANSMITTAL		Application Number	09/517,539		
		Filing Date	March 02, 2000		
FORM		First Named Inventor	Simon Robert Walmsley		
		Art Unit	3628		
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Examiner Name	NGA B Nguyen		
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	AUTH01US		
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC					
Fee Attached Amendment/Reply After Final Affidavits/declaration(s) Extension of Time Request Express Abandonment Request Information Disclosure Statement Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application		Drawing(s) Licensing-related Papers Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence A Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s) Landscape Table on CD rks kia.silverbrook@silverbrookres one: 61-2-9818-6633 le: 61-2-9555 7762	ddress	Appea of Appea (Appea (Appea) Propri Status Other below)	Il Communication to Board leals and Interferences Il Communication to TC Il Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) letary Information Letter Enclosure(s) (please Identify
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT					
Firm Name					
Signature Libby Por 1.					
Printed name Simon Robert Walmsley and Paul Lapstun					
Date October	25, 2005	F	Reg. No.		
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING					
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature					
	_				
Typed or printed name				Date	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Serial Number: 09/517,539

Application. Filed: March 02, 2000

Applicant: Simon Robert Walmsley and Paul Lapstun

Application Title: Validation Protocol and System

Examiner/GAU: NGA B Nguyen

Dated October 25, 2005

At: Balmain, NSW

Docket No. AUTH01US

REPLY TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT (UNDER 37 CFR 1.121)

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, District of Columbia 20231

Dear Sir:

In reply to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated October 11, 2005, the Applicant now resends the response via Fedex instead of facsimile to ensure response is clearly readable.

It is respectfully submitted that the issues raised are traversed, being hereinafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 11 as being unpatentable over Shigenaga (US Patent No. 4,710,613) in view of Lee (US Patent No. 5,923,759.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the following comments.

The Applicant respectfully submits that a skilled person in the art would not be motivated to combine Shigenaga with Lee as the cited documents teach very opposing authentication systems. Additionally, as required under MPEP at 2143, "...there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings."